(*b*) why the Standing Order under which no official should be kept in the same place for more than three years has not been applied to these officials ?

A.—Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Minister for Public Works).—

(*a*) 502.

(*b*) The Standing Order has been applied to the officials of the Board to a limited extent since posts available in places outside Bangalore are limited.

Member's Representation.

† Sri S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).—On the 16th of this month we discussed a special motion of public importance regarding the students' strike. During the course of discussion and reply, the Hon'ble Minister for Education and the Chief Minister said that they were going to decide this question of fees which would be made known in a day or two. But, to our surprise, we find that the reply given by the Education Minister or the Chief Minister revealing the decisions of the Government ignoring this House and taking away the privilege of this House, amounts to violation of the privilege of this House. That promise has not been fulfilled on the floor of this House though this House was in session. By revealing information elsewhere, they have to that extent ignored this House and the privilege of this House has been violated and encroached upon. So, this is a very serious deviation from the set procedure of this House and I protest agaiust the attitude of the Education Minister and the Chief Minister, who have ignored this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the Hon'ble Member raising a question of privilege or protest ? If he wants to protest, he can protest at a later stage.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I am raising a question of privilege, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will deal with it.

2-00 P.M.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—Sir, recently you have given a ruling about this : Ministers making statements outside the Legislature when the Assembly is in session. Having that in mind, I very respectfully sumbit to the Chair and I support the motion of privilege. This was discussed here for 2½ hours.

Mr. SPEAKER.—On the question of Breach of Privilege, there is not going to be any debate. If he wants to tell me about my ruling, I should say that I know it.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—In spite of that, if the Minister behaves like that, what is it that we do here ?

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—I must know beforehand what it is. I do not.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It must pass through me to the Hon'ble Minister.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—Sir, strange are the ways of the Education Minister. We thought that the clarifications issued by the Education Minister in the Upper House were as ambiguous as the Education Minister himself.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is he dealing with the question of privilege ?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Yes, Sir. It is well known how much we were worried about students' strike that is going on in the old Mysore area. Knowing that well, the Education Minister thought it fit to make a statement in the Upper House. Even after making that statement, he could have shown us the courtesy of making a statement in the Lower House yesterday, so that we would also be enlightened,—if I may use that word. But unfortunately Sir, as it always happens, he has again rubbed us on the wrong side. This time, not only the Members of the House, but also the Speaker. I therefore very much like the matter to be taken up very seriously by this House. In a way, it is a questiyn of privilege of this House. I should think that this is a fit case which can be referred to the Privileges Committee, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, let me deal with this question of privilege. It is a very serious matter. Questions of privilege should not be raised so lightly. It is the prestige of the House that has to be maintained and if there is any attack on that, I will have no hesitation in condemning in the strongest terms any act, infringing the rights and privileges of the House. There are two points that have been brought in. One is that the Speaker has been rubbed on the wrong side. I have no wrong side and I will not allow anybody to rub me on the wrong side. I feel that the analogy that the Speaker also is involved in this is not correct, because, the ruling that I have given is abundantly clear. It is not my opinion. It is the opinion of almost every House. Most of the Hon'ble Members may have read in to day's paper the ruling given by the Speaker of the Lok Sabha relating to a certain statement by the Prime Minister to the Press before he entered the House with regard to a certain interview, discussion took place, and it was raised on a point of order, and it was very seriously pressed. The Speaker of the Lok Sabha took the trouble of gathering the facts. He asked the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister made a statement on the floor of the House. Then he gave that ruling. The ruling lays down as I have said precisely in my ruling: so far as any statements that are made by either the Hon'ble Chief Minister or any Hon'ble Minister, are concerned there is no question of privilege. There is no rigid convention that any Minister must make a statement for the first time on the floor of the House. But at the same time, it is pointed out that courtesy requires, that member who must be most dear to the Ministers, should have priority; and at a time when the Assembly is in session or when the Parliament is in session, it is said that it would be not wrong or perhaps even proper, if it is made known to the House first. However if circumstances warrant it and if it is done otherwise, it cannot be called a breach of privilege. Even if there are any such circumstances, and even if there is no question of privilege, it

will be a sort of violation of moral sanction rather than a matter of privilege, which is something more than moral sanction. Privilege means, vested right of the House, which is not to be violated. Members should watch and see that it is not violated. The Speaker with equal diligence should see that it is not violated and if it is violated, he should maintain the dignity and prestige of the House by protecting it. Now what has happeped here? These principles are to be applied. There is the Legislative Council also sitting. The Hon'ble Minister for Education has made a statement there. Can we have any grievance that it was made there? Are we to ignore the statement made in the Council? Should we insist that statement should be made always first on the floor of this House? Both are equally great and good.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—He has summoned and given that statement. It is not about making a statement on the floor of the Upper House. We do not object to it, Sir. It has got equal status.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The subject was discussed here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Therefore, I am happy and very happy that the House feels that the statement made in the Council is in perfect order. The question, therefore, arises whether it should have been made to the Press.

Having dealt with that and having said that there is no violation or breach of privilege, I come to the recommendatory or suggestion portion of the ruling that it might generally be made on the floor of the House. It was given to the press..

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I never made any statement to the Press. I must make it clear that I made no statement to the Press. Whatever statement I have made, they wanted certain clarifications and that clarification was given to them. It is not a statement. It is only a clarification that was given.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Whether that was a clarification that was given Sir...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it a conversation between the Hon'ble Member and the Minister? Am I not in the picture? Am I to be ignored? If he wants to think that my ruling is over, I have no objection.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, I raised the point that the Ministers and particularly the Hon'ble Chief Minister has gone out of Bangalore. When Rome was burning Nero was fiddling! It is something like that. Here the students are agitating and people are agitated about it, but the Chief Minister lightly goes away on election campaign. He has gone to Dharwar.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the question that he is formulating?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—In spite of protests made about two weeks ago the Chief Minister is going on election tours. Is this House to be treated so contemptuously? He seems to think that he is the Master of this House. I want to say that he should think that he is the servant of the House. If that is his attitude and that of the Government towards this House, I should say that this Government is treating this question

(SRI S. SIVAPPA)

very lightly. We have come to the conclusion that this Government is incapable...

MR. SPEAKER.—He can mention point by point. If the Hon'ble Member wants to say with regard to tours of Ministers, that has nothing to do with privilege issue. We will take up that subject separately. If he wants to criticise Ministers on account of the strike, he may deal with separately. Let him not mix up the issues. If he says that Ministers should not have gone on tour, I do not know whether they had gone on tour at all. If he wants to say that Ministers have gone on election campaign, he must raise it separately. If I find that he mixes up everything, I can give a common answer. The whole thing floats.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Chief Minister has left the place, Sir. That is the point.

SRI S. SIVAPPA.—I am coming to the next point. The Chief Minister and Ministers have not taken this House into their confidence and they have preferred other places to make Statements ignoring this House. The Education Minister has bungled in the whole matter. He is going...

MR. SPEAKER.—Difficulty arises if three things are mixed up.

SRI S. SIVAPPA.—He has not solved the problem. The students are agitated; they are going on strike. Yet, you are sitting adamently in the ivory throne. We are convinced that this Government is incapable of solving the problem. We do not get proper answers and replies from the Government. As a protest against the adamant attitude of the Government, against their policy, and how they are treating the students, we are staging a walk out.

(At this stage, Sri Sivappa, the Leader of the Opposition, walked out followed by other members of the Opposition).

Report of the Joint Select Committee on the Mysore Beedi Industrial Premises (Regulation of Conditions of Work) Bill, 1963.

Presentation.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS (Minister for Housing, Labour and Transport).—I beg to present the Report of the Joint Select Committee on the Mysore Beedi Industrial Premises (Regulation of Conditions of Work) Bill, 1962.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Report is presented.

Twenty-first Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

Presentation.

MR. SPEAKER.—I present the Twenty-first Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

SRI A. R. PANCHAGAVI.—I beg to move:

"That the House agrees with the Twenty-first Report of the Business Advisory Committee".